



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,589	04/04/2006	Masahisa Kawashima	286666US40PCT	3967

22850 7590 10/16/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KRISHNAN, VIVEK V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2445

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/16/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/574,589	Applicant(s) KAWASHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner VIVEK KRISHNAN	Art Unit 2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/4/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the Amendment/Arguments filed on June 26, 2008. Claims 18-34 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Objection to the Specification due to the embedded hyperlink have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Objections due to informalities have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections to Claims 18-34 have been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of Claims 18-34 have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to arguments with respect to Claims 18, 25, and 30:

- a. Arguments – Page 37: "At no point does Grynberg teach or suggest anything similar to a mail processing unit that acquires a generation argument and an actual recipient address and generates the alias address from these two components to formulate

Art Unit: 2145

a reply e-mail, as claimed... Grynberg, however, fails to teach or suggest any feature similar to the generation argument..."

Grynberg (column 4 lines 46-57 and column 5 lines 51-62) discloses concatenating information (the generation argument) with a Recipient ID (recipient address) to generate an alias address for outgoing e-mails including reply mail (column 8 lines 59-61).

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In view of the aforementioned argument that Grynberg discloses each and every limitation of Claims 18, 25, and 30, Applicant's argument is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 18, 25, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,216,227 B2 to Grynberg.

Art Unit: 2145

8. Regarding Claims 18, 25, and 30, Grynberg discloses a mail delivery system, mail delivering method, and mail delivering program (referenced hereinafter as the system) that receives an alias mail having an alias address different from a recipient address as a destination and replaces the destination with the recipient address to transfer the alias mail and receives a reply mail responding to the alias mail and replaces the recipient address with the alias address as a transmission source of the reply mail to transfer the reply mail, the mail delivery system comprising:

an alias mail processing unit that restores, when an alias mail having an alias address generated from the recipient address and a predetermined generation argument as a destination is received, the recipient address and the generation argument from the alias address, replaces the destination of the alias mail with the recipient address, and includes the generation argument in the alias mail to transfer to alias mail (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses decrypting the alias address, or encoded string, to produce the recipient address and generated argument, and replaces the alias address with the recipient address to transfer the mail); and

a reply mail processing unit that acquires, when a reply mail responding to the alias mail transferred by the alias mail processing unit is received, the generation argument from the reply mail, regenerates the alias address from the generation argument and a recipient address indicating a transmission source of the reply mail, and replaces the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address to transfer the reply mail (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses regenerating the alias address, or encoded string, from the generated argument and recipient

Art Unit: 2145

address indicating a transmission source of the reply mail, and replacing the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 19-24, 26-29, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grynberg as applied to Claims 18, 25, and 30 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,247 B1 to Sasyan et al. (hereinafter "Sasyan").

11. Regarding Claims 19, 26, and 31, Grynberg discloses each and every limitation of Claims 18, 25, and 30. Grynberg further discloses wherein the alias mail processing unit includes:

a recipient address restoring unit that restores, when the alias mail is received, the recipient address and the generation argument from the alias address (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses restoring the recipient address and generated argument from the alias address, or encoded string);

Grynberg does not explicitly disclose, however Grynberg, in further view of Sasyan, discloses a reply destination address generating unit that generates a reply destination address including the generation argument restored by the recipient address restoring unit and an

Art Unit: 2145

originator address indicating a transmission source of the alias mail (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64, discloses replacing the source address with a virtual address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses generating an alias address, or encoded string, using a address and a generated argument);

an alias mail transfer unit that replaces the destination of the alias mail with the recipient address restored by the recipient address restoring unit and replaces the transmission source of the alias mail with the reply destination address generated by the reply destination address generating unit to transfer the alias mail (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64, discloses replacing the destination with the actual recipient address and replacing the source with the virtual address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses replacing the destination with the recipient address), and

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify an alias mail processing unit, as disclosed by Grynberg, to include replacing the originator address with an alias address, as disclosed by Sasyan, in order to appropriately accommodate for reply messages (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64)

Grynberg discloses the reply mail processing unit includes: an alias address regenerating unit that regenerates the alias address from the generation argument restored by the originator address restoring unit and the recipient address indicating the transmission source of the reply mail (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses regenerating the alias address from a generation argument and the recipient address indicating the transmission source of the reply mail); and

Art Unit: 2145

Grynberg does not explicitly disclose, however Grynberg, in further view of Sasyan, discloses an originator address restoring unit that restores, when the reply mail is received, the originator address and the generation argument from the reply destination address that is a destination of the reply mail (Sasyan; column 8 lines 25-40, discloses restoring an originator address from the alias address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses restoring an original address from an alias address includes restoring a generated argument from the encoded string);

a reply mail transfer unit that replaces the destination of the reply mail with the originator address restored by the originator address restoring unit and replaces the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address regenerated by the alias address regenerating unit to transfer the reply mail (Sasyan; column 8 lines 25-40, discloses replacing the destination of the reply mail with an actual address and replacing the source of the reply mail with a virtual address to transfer the reply) (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses replacing the transmission source of a reply mail with an alias recipient address).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify an alias mail processing unit, as disclosed by Grynberg, to include replacing the originator address with an alias address, as disclosed by Sasyan, , in order to appropriately accommodate for reply messages (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64)

12. Regarding Claims 20, 27, and 32, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claims 19, 26, and 31. Grynberg further discloses wherein the generation

Art Unit: 2145

argument is information indicating transfer conditions that the alias mail transferred to the recipient should satisfy,

the alias mail processing unit further includes a transfer possibility judging unit that judges whether the alias mail satisfies transfer conditions restored by the recipient address restoring unit (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses judging whether the alias mail satisfies the restored transfer conditions included in the generated argument of the encoded string), and

the alias mail transfer unit transfers only an alias mail that is judged by the transfer possibility judging unit as satisfying the transfer conditions (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses only transferring alias mail that is judged as satisfying the transfer conditions).

13. Regarding Claim 21, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 20. Grynberg further discloses wherein the transfer conditions are transfer conditions that can be updated according to transfer of the alias mail,

the alias mail processing unit further includes a transfer conditions updating unit that updates, when it is judged by the transfer possibility judging unit that the transfer conditions are satisfied, the transfer conditions to generate the generation argument anew (Grynberg; column 4, discloses the generated argument in the encoded string including an updatable time stamp), and

the reply destination address generating unit generates a reply destination address including the generation argument generated anew by the transfer conditions updating unit instead of the generation argument restored by the recipient address restoring unit (Grynberg; column 4, discloses using the updated generation argument in the encoded string including the

Art Unit: 2145

time stamp rather than the old generation argument).

14. Regarding Claim 22, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 20. Grynberg further discloses wherein the transfer conditions are transfer conditions that can be updated according to reception of the alias mail,

the reply mail processing unit further includes a transfer conditions updating unit that updates the transfer conditions restored by the originator address restoring unit to generate the generation argument anew (Grynberg; column 4, discloses the generated argument in the encoded string including a time stamp updatable for every generated encoded string), and

the alias address regenerating unit regenerates an alias address including the generation argument generated anew by the transfer condition updating unit instead of the generation argument restored by the originator address restoring unit (Grynberg; column 4, discloses using the updated generation argument in the encoded string including the time stamp rather than the old generation argument).

15. Regarding Claims 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, and 34, Claims 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, and 34 have similar limitations to Claims 19-22. Therefore they are rejected under Grynberg and Sasyan for the same reasons as set forth in the rejections of Claims 19-22.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIVEK KRISHNAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VK

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445